

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA
WESTERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff, vs. JEREMY CROW, Defendant.	5:24-CR-50017-CCT ORDER
--	------------------------------------

The United States moves for a continuance due to the unavailability of an essential victim witness. Docket 34. Defense counsel does not object. *Id.* The defendant's Sixth Amendment right to confront adverse witnesses "may be satisfied absent a physical, face-to-face confrontation at trial only where denial of such confrontation is necessary to further an important public policy and only where the reliability of the testimony is otherwise assured." *Maryland v. Craig*, 497 U.S. 836, 850 (1990). Defense counsel objects to the essential witness testifying remotely, and in light of the above authority, the government has withdrawn its request that the essential witness be allowed to testify remotely. Docket 34 at 2. The court finds that the ends of justice served by continuing this trial outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial insofar as the case cannot proceed without the essential witness. Based on the foregoing, it is therefore

ORDERED that defendant's motion is granted. A scheduling order setting a new trial date, and specifying the revised deadlines, will follow this order.

The period of delay resulting from such continuance is excluded in computing the time within which the trial of the offense must commence. 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A).

Dated July 19, 2024.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ *Camela C. Theeler*

CAMELA C. THEELER
United States District Judge